Table A: Summary Performance Audit Evaluation Number-1/2/3/4

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Performance Auditor | : Dr. J. SRIHARI RAO, Former Professor & Dean NIT Warangal. |
| Dates of Performance Audit | : 19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013. |
| Name of Institution with location | : Government College of Engineering, Karad, Maharastra. |

| S. No. | Area of Performance Audit | Remarks |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Project Implementation | |
| 2. | Implementation of Institutional Reforms | |
| 3. | Administrative and Managerial Efficiency Improvement | |
| 4. | Qualitative Improvements related to Education and Research | |
| 5. | Institutional Governance | |
| 6. | Support to Weak UG Students | |

*Note:*

*For Table A, the Summary of Performance Audit Evaluation, is to be filled in by the Performance Auditor from the overall qualitative assessment for the Tables 1 to 6 as given ahead in this format for Performance Audit Report.*

# Performance Auditors Report

Table-1: Project Implementation

Name of Performance Auditor : Dr. J. SRIHARI RAO, Former Professor & Dean NIT Warangal.
Dates of Performance Audit : 19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013.
Name of Institution with location : Government College of Engineering, Karad, Maharastra.

| Sl. No. | Aspect | Assessment Grade (1-3) | Supporting Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Progress in securing Autonomous Institution status from the affiliating University & the UGC within 2 years of joining the Project<br>**OR**<br>Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/ obtained | 2 | Application submitted to Shivaji University. |
| 2. | Sufficiency and quality of academic buildings | 2 | Sufficient built up Area.- Requires face lifting. |
| 3. | Progress/achievement in starting new PG programs as evidenced by:<br>• Securing AICTE approval<br>• Establishment of laboratories<br>• Adequacy of student enrolments<br>• Cumulative number of assistantships granted | N/A | Not Proposed. |
| 4. | Progress/achievement in strengthening existing PG programs as evidenced by:<br>• Establishment of proposed laboratories<br>• Adequacy of student enrolments<br>• Cumulative number of assistantships granted | 2 | No new labs proposed.<br>Students enrollment is less.<br>Fourteen non GATE Scholarships Granted. |
| 5. | Progress/achievement in strengthening existing UG programs in Govt funded and aided institutions only as evidenced by:<br>• Establishment of proposed laboratories<br>• Adequacy of student enrolments | 2 | Students enrollment is satisfactory.<br>Equipment is under procurement for strengthening the existing labs. |
| 6. | Improvements in Faculty Development as evidenced by:<br>• Percentage/ increase in percentage of faculty benefiting from the Core Module of pedagogical training<br>• Percentage of / increase in percentage of faculty benefiting from the Advanced Module of pedagogical training<br>• Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification<br>• Percentage of faculty deputed for subject domain training, seminars, etc. | 2 | nil<br>to be organized by SPFU / NPIU.<br>3 out of 6 faculty on contract basis registered for M.Tech.<br>Majority of the existing Faculty attended |

J Srihari

| Sl. No. | Aspect | Assessment Grade (1-3) | Supporting Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *(faculty benefiting from subject domain training are required to share their gains with peers and also put their report on training on institution's web site)* | | subject domain training and seminars. |
| 7. | Generation, retention and utilization of the non-tuition fee revenue generated through various activities | 2 | Development fee from open category students – utilized for Minor refurbishment works and gardening etc. |
| 8. | Engineering faculty positions in terms of:<br>• Reduction in vacancies<br>• Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis<br>• Increase in the number of faculty with at least a Masters degree | 3 | Vacancies increased due to transfers.<br>No Recruitment.<br>All existing regular faculty are P.G. and above qualified. |
| 9. | Improvements in placement rate of UG pass outs | 1 | 64% in 2010-2011, 67% in 2011-2012. |
| 10. | Enhanced interaction with industry as evidenced by:<br>• Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters & Doctoral programs<br>• Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas<br>• Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured by the institution<br>• Increase in the number of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in industry<br>• Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula & syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements, evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures<br>• Increase in the number of sandwich programs between industries and the institution | 2 | 4 persons form *Industry registered in* Civil Dept.<br>Some faculty involved in conducting training Programs at other places.<br>Civil Dept. involved in Consultancy works.<br>Students and faculty visits to Industry are being arranged.<br>Visits by Industry experts arranged on Saturdays.<br>No Sandwich Programs. |

# Performance Auditors Report

**Table 2. Performance Audit - Implementation of Institutional Reforms**

Name of Performance Auditor : **Dr. J. Srihari Rao.**
Dates of Performance Audit : **19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013.**
Name of Institution with location : **G C E ,Karad, Maharastra.**

| Sl. No. | Aspect | Assessment Grade (1-3) | Supporting Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students as evidenced by:<br>• Percentage/ increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects<br>• Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement?<br><br>If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective? | 2 | Online feedback introduced recently.<br><br>Yes – used for counseling .<br><br>Principal & HOD together counsel the Faculty. |
| 2. | Establishment of four funds and their sizes | 3 | Bank Accounts opened with Minimum Balance of Rs. 500/-. |
| 3. | Offer of incentives to faculty for participation in consultancy, R&D and continuing education programs offered by the institution | 2 | As per Maharastra Govt. norms |

J Srihari

# Performance Auditors Report

**Table-3 Performance Audit - Improvement in Administrative and Managerial Efficiencies**

**Name of Performance Auditor : Dr.J.Srihari Rao**

**Dates of Performance Audit : 19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013.**

**Name of Institution with location : G C E , Karad**

| S. No. | Aspect | Assessment Grade (1-3) | Supporting Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Modernization and decentralization of administration and financial management | 3 | Not yet implemented. |
| 2. | Responsiveness to students academic and non-academic requirements | 2 | Principal & HODs respond to the requirements of students. |
| 3. | Responsiveness to faculty requirements | 2 | Principal & HODs respond |
| 4. | Utilization of institutional resource s | 2 | Available resources utilized with minimum powers. |
| 5. | Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities | 3 | Maintenance is not sufficient. |
| 6. | Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries | 3 | Yet to be implanted. |

# Performance Auditors Report

Table 4. Performance Audit - Quality of Education and Research

Name of Performance Auditor : **Dr. J. Srihari Rao.**

Dates of Performance Audit : **19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013.**

Name of Institution with location : **G C E , Karad.**

| S. No. | Aspect | Assessment Grade (1-3) | Supporting Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Improvements in curricula and /or syllabi | 3 | Affiliated college of Shivaji University, No academic autonomy. |
| 2. | Relevance of curricula and syllabi | 2 | Students accepted by Industry. |
| 3. | Improvement in teaching-learning processes as evidenced by:<br>• Use of teaching aids<br>• Continuous evaluation through quiz, assignments or mid-semester examinations etc. Sharing of answer scripts with students and explanation of the evaluation carried out<br>• Introduction of flexibility in program offerings<br>• Increased availability of adequate electives | 2 | OHP / LCD projectors are used.<br>Mid exam. Assignments & attendance etc. Corrected scripts shown to the students.<br>no flexibility.<br>Electives offered. |
| 4. | Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programs (*institutions are to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programs accredited and/or applied for within 2 years of joining the Project*) | 3 | Yet to apply for accreditation. |
| 5. | Increased collaboration with industry in R&D as | 3 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | evidenced by:<br>• Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored R&D work undertaken<br>• Increase in financial contribution by industry for R&D | | NIL |
| 6. | Increase in percentage of revenue from externally funded R&D projects and consultancies in the total revenue of the institution from all sources | 2 | About Rs. 20,00,000/- generated through testing & consultancy during the last two years. |
| 7. | Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals | 2 | Existing senior faculty are publishing research papers |
| 8. | Increase in the number of patents filed | 1 | 1 US patent ( Electrical) & 1 Indian patent ( Mechanical ) filed during 1 January, 2012 to 1 January 2013. |

# Performance Auditors Report

**Table 5. Performance Audit - Performance in the Governance of Institutions**

Name of Performance Auditor : **Dr.J. Srihari Rao.**
Dates of Performance Audit : **19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013.**

Name of **Institution with location** : **G C E, Karad.**

The objective of an Institutional Governance Review is to assist institutions, using an evidence–based approach, in their self assessment of current Governance Practice. A thorough review will indicate the level of effectiveness of institutional governance and the Governing Body, and identify action points for improvement. It will also indicate that:

- The conduct of the Governing Body is in accordance with the standards of behavior that the public should rightfully expect.
- The Governing Body and the individual Governors are exercising their responsibilities in the interest of the institution as a whole.
- The Review has been undertaken by a Group who have internal and external credibility to undertake such exercise.

| | **INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE** | **Assessment Grade (1-3)** | **Supporting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | **A. PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES** | | |
| | • Has the Governing Body approved the institutional strategic vision, mission and plan – identifying a clear development path for the institution through its long-term business plans and annual budgets? | 2 | BOG was formed recently , had only one meeting. Approved IDP. |
| | • Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability | 2 | Nominated monitoring committees. |
| | • Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements? | 3 | Only one meeting was conducted sofar. |
| | • Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance? | 2 | Head of the Institution is member Secretary of B O G . |

J Srihari

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | **B. OPENNESS & TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES** | | |
| | • Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance? | 3 | Yet to start as the BOG is less than 1 year old. |
| | • Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body? | 3 | No |
| | • Is the Governing Body conducted in an open a manner, and does it provide as much information as possible to students, faculty, the general public and potential employers on all aspects of institutional activity related to academic performance, finance and management? | 3 | News letter planned to be released shortly. |
| 3. | **C. KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES** | | |
| | • Are the size, skills, competences and experiences of the Governing Body, such that it is able to carry out its primary accountabilities effectively and efficiently, and ensure the confidence of its stakeholders and constituents? | 1 | As per the U.G.C. norms constituted. Size is only 10. |
| | • Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?<br>Does the Governing Body have actively involved independent members and is the institution free from direct political interference to ensure academic freedom and focus on long term educational objectives? | 2 | Chairman and external members nominated by Maharastra Govt. |
| | • Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the Governing Body clearly stated? | 2 | As per the U.G.C. norms. |
| | • Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively? | 2 | Only one meeting after its formation. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | D. **EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES** | | |
| | • Does the Governing Body keep their effectiveness under regular review and in reviewing its performance, reflect on the performance of the institution as a whole in meeting its long-term strategic objectives and its short-term indicators of performance/success? | 3 | BO G was recently formed. |
| | • Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary? | 2 | Inducted as per the govt. norms. |
| 5. | E. **REGULATORY COMPLIANCE** | | |
| | • Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern of the institution. | 2 | Compliance to the norms of AICTE,Shivaji University and Govt. of Maharastra. |
| | • Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions? | 1 | It is a Govt. Institute. |
| | • Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give details name, status of current accreditation etc | 3 | Programs offered are yet to be accredited . |

J Snile.

# Performance Auditors Report

Table 6. Performance Audit - Support to Weak Students

Name of Performance Auditor : **Dr. J. Srihari Rao.**
Dates of Performance Audit : **19 – 21st Forenoon March, 2013.**

Name of Institution with location : **G C E ,Karad.**

| S. No. | Aspect | Assessment Grade (1-3) | Supporting Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Percentage of students that complete the full first year and transit successfully to Second Year | 2 | 56.27% in 2010- 2011, 67.42% in 2011-2012 |
| 2. | Effectiveness of techniques used for identifying weak students | 2 | Previous University exam, Mid exam and request from students. |
| 3. | Conduct of remedial teaching throughout academic session | 2 | After office hours during later part of semester |
| 4. | Conduct of specialized soft skills and professional skills training | 2 | Professionals are engaged. |
| 5. | Increase in the number of campus interviews | 2 | No.of Campus interviews reasonable in the current situation. |
| 6. | Establishment and functioning of a Finishing School | 3 | Not yet |
| 7. | Increase in the number of internal and external students that attend high intensity training conducted by the Finishing School | 3 | Not Yet |

**Improvements noticed on shortcomings reported during earlier Performance Audits**

Not Applicable. This is the 1st Visit.

---

**Brief statements on continuing shortcomings and reasons thereof:**

**Data Auditor's visit was not arranged to match with that of performance Auditor.**

The main hurdle in the progress of the Implementation of the project is lack of human resources in this college – severe shortage of faculty & staff. Present strength is less than 50% . With this man power situation, how does the college get accreditation and autonomy? Even decentralization & reforms will not have any meaning. Another problem is transfers among the government colleges.

The state govt. should take immediate action and conduct special recruitment drive. There should not be any transfers from this college till the end of the project. The BOG & SPFU should apply pressure on the concerned.

**Recommendations for Mentor and BOG.**

Though the existing senior faculty are struggling hard, the project can not be implemented as envisaged, unless the manpower improves. Old buildings need face lift. A lot of maintenance of the equipment is required.

BOG may review its performance as per the guidelines given in "Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies " and play its crucial role in the development of the Institute.